

REMARKS

The above amendment is made in response to the Office action of May 13, 2003. Claims 1-3, 15, and 29 have been amended. Claims 1-32 are pending in the present application. The Examiner's reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the above amendment and the following remarks.

Claims 1-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosin et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,295,057) in view of Williams et al (U.S. 5,945,988). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended claims 1 and 15 recite, *inter alia*, the step of "defining a social interaction genre." Amended claim 29 recites, *inter alia*, the step of "receiving requests from the plurality of users to participate in a social interactive session." "Genres" are defined on page 1, line 10 as "structured styles of interaction." The "interactions" referred in the present disclosure are described on page 10, lines 5 as "[interactions] that take place via networked services."

The term "social interaction" is introduced on page 1, line 9. The term "social" is defined in the American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language (4th ed., 2000) as "of or relating to human society and its modes of organization." Social interaction as human interaction is further supported by the disclosure. An example of social interaction as human interaction is provided on page 1, line 13 to page 2, line 14, which describes a structured interaction between a speaker giving a lecture and an audience of spectators. The structured interaction in the example provides rules governing when a spectator may ask a question to the speaker. The interaction is between two or more humans. Another example of social interaction as human interaction is provided on page 13, line 21 to page

14, line 1, which describes a debate between a “For” and an “Against” team. The disclosure on page 29, lines 3-5 states that rules for the debate may include “indicating that turn will be allocated so that the turn to speak alternates back and forth between the For and Against teams.” This further clarifies that the debate genre is between human teams. Yet another example is provided on page 29, line 21 to page 30, line 8, which is a non-exhaustive list of examples of genres, as used in the present invention. As disclosed in the present application, examples of genres include “a personal office which an area owned by one user in which visitors come and talk – mostly to the office owner; a court room interaction genre, having a judge, defendant, plaintiff, defending and prosecuting attorneys, witnesses, jury, and spectators; and a help line with help requesters and providers.” The examples used in the present application illustrate that “social interaction” refers to human interaction.

Accordingly, a “social interaction genre,” as claimed in the present application, includes at least a structured interaction between/among humans that takes place via networked services. Similarly, a “social interactive session,” as claimed in the present application, includes at least an interactive session between/among humans via networked services.

Rosin et al describes an internet on-demand system for television presenting internet content and traditional television programming as part of a single coherent interface. Although Rosin et al describes user interaction via the Internet, the interaction is between a user and the on-demand system. It is not a social interaction, as claimed in the present application.

Williams et al describes a method and apparatus for automatically determining and dynamically updating user preferences in an entertainment system. Similar to Rosin et al, Williams et al describes user interaction with the entertainment system, but the interaction is not a social interaction between/among humans.

Rosin et al and Williams et al, alone or in combination, do not disclose “defining a social interaction genre” as claimed in claims 1 and 15 of the present application or “receiving requests from the plurality of users to participate in a social interactive session,” as claimed in claim 29.

Accordingly, amended claims 1, 15, and 29 are believed to be patentably distinguishable and nonobvious over Rosin et al and Williams et al. Dependent claims 2-14, 16-28, and 30-32 are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for claims 1, 15, and 29. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-32 is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Frank Chau
Reg. No. 34,136
Attorney for Applicants

F.CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLP
1900 Hempstead Turnpike, Suite 501
East Meadow, New York 11554
Telephone: (516) 357-0091
Facsimile: (516) 357-0092